

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO), AZ-C030

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-013-0024-DNA

CASE FILE NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Renewal of Whettrod /vending SRP for 2013-2017 located at the London Bridge Beach (Private Property)

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T13N R20W Section 15

APPLICANT (if any): Whettrods PWC Rentals, Jennifer and Michael Whetten

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Continue a five year permit authorized to Whettrods PWC Rentals signed on January 30, 2012 and valid through October 31, 2017. Applicants have been permitted to vend fourteen water crafts and six paddleboards in Lake Havasu City, AZ. The applicants have received written permission to use and conduct business on private property at London Bridge Beach (**See Attached Map**). The Bureau of Land Management has issued the applicants vending permits since 2010. Whettrods current permit is valid for seasonal use from March 1 until October 31, 2012- 2017.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP name: *Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan*

Date approved: May 10, 2007

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

RR-4: Desired Future Conditions for the Lake Havasu Special Recreation Management Area are:

Primary Market Strategy: Destination

Market: Residents of and visitors to the Lake Havasu Region.

SRMA Desired Future Condition: Manage high-volume recreation on the lake and shoreline to sustain natural resource values and recreational opportunities.

RR-60: Within the SRMA (Lake Havasu) BLM will require SRPs for organized events and activities that impact the public lands comprising the lake bottom and shoreline.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2010-0001-EA Vending in Thompson Bay Area of Influence signed April 20, 2010.

DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2012-0017-DNA Renewal of Whettrod /vending SRP signed December 12, 2011.

- 1964 Lower Colorado River Land Use Plan

The first major planning effort for Federal lands along the Colorado River. It was prepared by the U.S. Department of the Interior under special authorities. It resulted in numerous recommendations, many of which related to recreation development of the shorelines along the lower Colorado River waterways.

- 1982 Lake Havasu Habitat Management Plan

This is the current Habitat Management Plan for the area. This is a cooperative management plan that requires the signature of the State Wildlife Agency to meet the requirements of the Sikes Act.

- 1996 Arizona Historic Preservation Plan

This plan was developed by the Arizona State Parks Department to be implemented in the protection and conservation of Arizona's historic and cultural resources, including guidelines for management of cultural sites on public lands.

Management of commercial recreation uses on public lands is governed by **43 CFR 2930 and (Subpart) 2932** and policy is dictated in **BLM Manual 2930** and **BLM Manual Handbook H-2930-1**.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The new proposed action is exactly the same as the proposed action alternative analyzed in EA DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2010-0001-EA and DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2012-0017-DNA. The proposed activity falls within the same environmental scope and setting analyzed in the referenced EA. There are no differences between this proposed action alternative and the referenced EA. Page 5 of the EA, under the Proposed Action, describes the location and issuance of permits for these types of activities.

Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? The project is in the North West portion of Thompson Bay the overall study area addressed in DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2010--0001-EA page 5: Stationary shoreline watercraft rental operation(s) in Thompson Day along a small beach in from of the Sand Bar Grill (AZ_State Department Lease) if the land lease holder allows vendor access to public lands.

If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial? There are no differences.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Yes, four alternatives were considered in the referenced EA document. There are no changes in the proposed action, environmental concerns, interests, or resource values since the referenced NEPA analysis was completed. The public has proposed no new alternatives.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action? Yes, the analysis undertaken in the referenced EA is still valid. There is no new information or circumstances since that time that would change the analysis of the new proposal to continue the Special Recreation Permit to Whettrods.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? The environmental effects that would result from continuing the Special Recreation Permit to Whettrods would be the same, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as those that were disclosed in the reference the 2010 EA.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes, the public and interagency involvement review is adequate for the current proposed action because the event is supported by the public and is not considered to be controversial.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Doug Adams,	Fisheries Biologist	BLM
Amanda Deeds,	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BLM
Dr. George Shannon,	Archaeologist	BLM
David Daniels	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

<u>/s/ Amanda Deeds Authenticated: Amanda Deeds</u>	<u>4/11/2013</u>
Amanda Deeds	Date
Project Lead	

<u>/s/ Dave Daniels Authenticated: Amanda Deeds</u>	<u>7/17/2013</u>
David Daniels	Date
Planning and Environmental Coordinator	

<u>/s/ Jayson Barangan Authenticated: Amanda Deeds</u>	<u>4/29/2013</u>
Jayson Barangan	Date
Assistant Field Manager	
Recreation and Visitor Services	

<u>/s/ Amanda Dodson (Acting) Authenticated: Amanda Deeds</u>	<u>5/3/2013</u>
Signature of the Responsible Official	Date
Kimber Liebhauser	
Field Manager	
- Lake Havasu Field Office	

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest and appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

DECISION RECORD

Tracking Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2013-0024-DNA

Description of the Proposed Action: Continue a five year permit authorized to Whettrods PWC Rentals signed on January 30, 2012 and valid through October 31, 2017. Applicants have been permitted to vend fourteen water crafts and six paddleboards in Lake Havasu City, AZ. The applicants have received written permission to use and

conduct business on private property at London Bridge Beach (**See Attached Map**). The Bureau of Land Management has issued the applicants vending permits since 2010. Whettrods current permit is valid for seasonal use from March 1 until October 31, 2012-2017.

LUP Name: *Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan*
Date approved: May 10, 2007

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy and as analyzed in the previous environmental assessment DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2010-0001-EA Vending in Thompson Bay Area of Influence signed April 20, 2010. I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

<u>/s/ Kimber Liebhauser Authenticated: Amanda Deeds</u>	<u>5/3/2013</u>
Signature of the Responsible Official	Date
Kimber Liebhauser	
Field Manager	
Lake Havasu Field Office	

Exhibits:

- 1) Stipulations: